

**REMARKS**

This Amendment cancels claims 11-13, 16 and 17, amends claims 1 and 19, and adds new claim 20. The 0.035 vinyl groups/nm<sup>2</sup> surface density feature of claim 1 is supported by Table 2, preparation No. 4 on page 18 of the specification as original filed. Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 1. New claim 20 is supported by page 5, lines 31-36. Claims 1-10, 14, 15 and 18-20 are pending.

This Amendment overcomes the restriction requirement. Non-elected claims 11-13 have been canceled, subject to the applicants' right to file a divisional application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

This Amendment overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 19, which has been amended to depend from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claim 19 are respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-19 over WO 98/05723 to Bohin et al. (corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 6,369,184) is traversed. A feature of the claimed process for the production of an assembly comprising several silicone elements is the production of a crosslinked silicone element having a surface

density of unreacted residual alkenyl groups equal to or greater than  $0.035/\text{nm}^2$ . These unreacted alkenyl groups exhibit excellent bonding with another crosslinked silicone element.

Silicone elastomers are intrinsically anti-adhesive. The improved adhesion of the elements prepared in the claimed process is particularly attractive for the manufacture of multi-layer silicone coatings, which can be used for protection and/or mechanical strengthening of various flexible substrates, including airbags.

Bohin et al. fails to expressly disclose the  $0.035$  alkenyl group/ $\text{nm}^2$  surface density feature of the claimed process. The reference also fails to inherently disclose the surface density feature of the claimed process. Applicants agree the silicone coating C1 summarized in Table 1 (Col. 14, lines 30-47) of Bohin et al. is similar to the reference composition set forth on page 16, Example 1 of this application. However, the reference composition is a comparative composition, not an inventive composition. The surface density of the crosslinked reference composition was  $0.005$  alkenyl groups/ $\text{nm}^2$ , well below the  $0.035$  alkenyl group/ $\text{nm}^2$  surface density feature of the claimed process. An assembly comprising silicone elements prepared from the inventive composition No. 4 exhibited a peel strength of  $3.1$  N/cm, much greater than the  $1.0$

N/cm peel strength exhibited by an assembly prepared from the reference composition. Compare Test 4 to Test 1 on page 20 of the application.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-19 over Bohin et al. are earnestly requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7 over Bohin et al. is also traversed. As discussed above, a feature of the claimed process for the production of an assembly comprising several silicone elements is the production of a crosslinked silicone element having a surface density of unreacted residual alkenyl groups equal to or greater than  $0.035/\text{nm}^2$ . These unreacted alkenyl groups exhibit excellent bonding (as measured by peel strength) with another crosslinked silicone element.

Bohin et al. fails to raise a prima facie case of obviousness against the claimed process. One of ordinary skill in the art is given no motivation, teaching or apparent reason to modify the Bohin et al. composition by increasing the surface density of unreacted alkenyl groups of a crosslinked coating of the composition from 0.005 to  $0.035 \text{ groups}/\text{nm}^2$ . Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 7 are respectfully requested.

The obvious-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-10 over claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,423,234 is respectfully traversed. The claims of this application are patentably distinct from those of the '234 patent. More specifically, claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-10 of this application require crosslinking a liquid silicone preparation, the composition of this preparation and the crosslinking conditions being chosen in such a way that the crosslinked silicone element has a surface density SD of unreacted, residual alkenyl groups, per nm<sup>2</sup>, equal to or greater than 0.035. The '234 patent claims do not recite this limitation, and one of ordinary skill in the art is given no motivation, teaching or suggestion to modify the '234 patent claims to include such an unreacted, residual alkenyl group surface density limitation. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obvious-type double patenting rejection are respectfully requested.

It is believed this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of claims 1-10 and 14-19, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance directed to claims 1-10, 14, 15 and 18-20, are earnestly requested. The Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned should he believe any further action is required for allowance.

U.S. Appln. S.N. 10/518,404  
AMENDMENT

**PATENT**

It is not believed any fee is required for entry and consideration of this Amendment. Nevertheless, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1258 in the amount of any such required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

/James C. Lydon/

James C. Lydon  
Reg. No. 30,082

Atty. Case No.: **PLAS-024**  
100 Daingerfield Road  
Suite 100  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 838-0445  
Facsimile: (703) 838-0447